Applicant(s) Application No. SUMIKAWA ET AL. 09/782,180 Interview Summary **Art Unit Examiner** 2814 DiLinh Nguyen All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) Elliot Goldberg. (1) DiLinh Nguyen. (4)____ (2) Douglas Wille. Date of Interview: 25 February 2003. b) Video Conference Type: a) Telephonic 2) applicant's representative] c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant e) No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1,5 and 17. Identification of prior art discussed: Toyosawa Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the interview, claims 1, 5 and 17 and reference Toyosawa are discussed, but no agreement was reached. It was noted that relative to the thickness of usual semiconductor substrate a tape will inherently provide reinforcement . (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

checked).

Examiner's signature, if required